

**Introduction for the WELS Website
About the
Christian Standard Bible (CSB) Translation Suggestions
Submitted in May 2019
By the WELS Translation Liaison Committee (TLC)**

In November 2018, the WELS Translation Liaison Committee was informed that there will be a very modest revision of the CSB in the coming years and that the CSB oversight committee will be meeting in July 2019 to consider possible improvements. We were invited to send some suggestions—not hundreds, but our “top ten or so.”

In response to this invitation, the TLC prepared the following suggestions. The first six are more substantial, taking a good deal of time and thought to prepare. The last twenty-eight are more editorial—matters of English style together with some typos.

In this process, the TLC was helped by the work of the WELS CSB Review Committee, chaired by Pastor John Vieths. We looked at all of the passages specially mentioned in the report of the Review Committee, as published in the *2018 Report to the Twelve Districts*. We also perused the raw data submitted by the nearly 100 WELS reviewers, since this information was shared with the TLC with the names of the reviewers removed.

We will be eager to see how the CSB revision goes, and we wish them God’s blessings. Comments about the CSB or our TLC suggestions may be directed to any TLC member.

Prof. Thomas Nass, chairman
Rev. Brett Brauer
Prof. Kenneth Cherney, Jr.
Prof. Joel Fredrich
Rev. Geoffrey Kieta
Rev. Glenn Schwanke
Prof. Paul Zell

**Translation Suggestion for the CSB
From the WELS Translation Liaison Committee
May 2019**

Bible Reference:

Isaiah 55:3

Original text:

וְאֶכְרַתָּהּ לָכֶם בְּרִית עוֹלָם חֲסִדֵי יְהוָה הַנְּאֻמָּנִים:

CSB rendering:

I will make a permanent covenant with you
on the basis of the faithful kindnesses of David.*

**Or with you, the faithful acts of kindness shown to David*

Suggestion:

Preferred option:

I will make a permanent covenant with you,
the faithful acts of kindness shown to David.

Acceptable option:

I will make a permanent covenant with you,
the faithful acts of kindness shown to David.*

**Or shown by David*

Rationale:

The passage is a well-known *crux*: in the phrase “the kindnesses of David,” should “of David” be understood as a “subjective” or “objective genitive”? The grammar permits either, and context should be decisive.

First, it should be noted that the next verse (55:4) speaks of the Lord’s appointing David “a witness to the peoples, a leader and commander for the peoples.” Acts of **חֲסִדֵי** done by David are not in the picture. Second, Isaiah 55:3 has its roots in the Lord’s promise to David in 2 Samuel 7:15-16, and it strongly alludes to the psalmist’s appeals to this promise in Psalm 89:25, 29, 34, and 50 (Eng. 24, 28, 33, and 49). Accordingly, most interpreters of Isaiah see 55:3 as a “democratization” of the promise made to David so that it now applies to the entire Judahite community.¹ Finally, in Acts 13:32-35, Paul’s citing of Isaiah 55:3 (together with Psalm 2:7 and Psalm 16:10) as a proof text for the Messiah’s resurrection from the dead makes little sense if “the mercies of David” in Isaiah 55:3 are acts of kindness that David did. That “of David” is an “objective genitive” is the position of most translations by far (ESV, JPS, NASB, NET,

¹ R. Lessing, *Isaiah 40-55* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 2011), 662; C. North, *The Second Isaiah* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1964), 258; S. Paul, *Isaiah 40-66* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 2012), 438; etc.

NIV, NLT, NRSV, etc.), and correctly so. We are aware of Gentry's arguments to the contrary and do not find them persuasive.²

We approve of the wording of the CSB footnote because "faithful acts of kindness" is more idiomatic than "faithful kindnesses." Also, we regard "the faithful acts of kindness shown to David" as appositional to "a permanent covenant." They are not the "basis" for the covenant; they *are* the covenant. This is not only the most natural way to read the Hebrew; it also communicates that the "kindnesses" are a transfer and a continuation of the very same promises made in 2 Samuel 7.

It could be objected that CSB's rendering "the faithful kindnesses of David" is an attempt simply to translate literally and to let readers decide the nature of the "genitive" for themselves. We would answer that because English is not Hebrew, a reader/hearer of the target text is not in the same position to make this decision as an original reader/hearer of the source text. An English reader/hearer will naturally understand "the faithful kindnesses of David" as "the faithful and kind acts that David did"—the interpretation that is less likely.

If the *crux* absolutely must be made visible to CSB's target reader, then we would propose the "Acceptable option" above. We present the footnote in the way that we do in order to zero in on the issue of the objective or subjective "genitive."

² P. Gentry, "Rethinking the 'Sure Mercies of David' in Isaiah 55:3," *WTJ* 69 (2007) 279-304.

Translation Suggestion for the CSB
From the WELS Translation Liaison Committee
May 2019

Bible Reference:

Malachi 2:15

Original text:

וְלֹא־אֶתְּךָ עָשָׂה וְיִשְׁאָר רֵיחַ לֹוּ וּמָה הָאֶתְּךָ מִבְּקֹשׁ וְנָרַע אֱלֹהִים וְנִשְׁמַרְתֶּם בְּרֵוּחְכֶם וּבְאִשָּׁת נְעוּרֵיךָ אֶל־
יְבָגֵד:

CSB rendering:

Didn't God make them one and give them a portion of spirit? What is the one seeking? *Godly offspring. So watch yourselves carefully, so that no one acts treacherously against the wife of his youth.

* Hb obscure

Suggestion:

Didn't God make you one, and don't your flesh and spirit belong to him? What is the one God^A seeking?^B Godly offspring. So watch yourselves carefully, so that no one acts treacherously against the wife of his youth.

^A Or *the marriage union*

^B Hb first half of verse obscure

Rationale:

We know that this is a notoriously difficult verse, and we don't claim any special insight into explaining it definitively. But the choice of the CSB for וְיִשְׁאָר רֵיחַ לֹוּ—out of all the interpretive possibilities—strikes us as improbable and unfortunate. We have trouble seeing how the Hebrew preposition לֹוּ (“to him”) can be rendered “to them.” In addition, the English phrase “a portion of spirit [lower case]” seems strange to our ears, and we are unsure what is meant with it. We fear that this phrase will communicate nothing intelligible to the average reader.

We are content to follow the CSB interpretation of וְלֹא־אֶתְּךָ עָשָׂה: “Didn't he [God] make one [in marriage]?” This phrase could be translated differently, but the CSB rendering makes sense in this context talking about marriage.

Once this interpretive decision is made, however, it seems difficult to make the following phrase of the MT fit: וְיִשְׁאָר רֵיחַ לֹוּ (“and a portion of spirit/Spirit to him”). The antecedent of the pronoun לֹוּ would most naturally be God, the subject of the verb עָשָׂה. The unique combination וְיִשְׁאָר רֵיחַ—in and of itself an anomaly in the OT—seems inappropriate to ascribe to God.

We notice that some commentators (e.g., Baldwin, Rudolph, Deutsch) and many English translations (including GW, NABRE, NJB, NIV, NLT, NRSV, NLT, REB) reprint the word יִשְׁאָר to אֶשָׁר (“flesh”). This results in a phrase that is not the smoothest (“and flesh, spirit to him”). But it can be

understood to fit nicely in the context, whether it is rendered as a statement of fact or included in the rhetorical question. Here is another reason why God is concerned about couples remaining faithful in marriage: Couples belong to him, with both their flesh and spirit.

In regard to the next phrase—**וַיִּמְהַלֵּה הָאֱלֹהִים מִבְּקֶשׁ יָרַע אֱלֹהִים**—we are also content with the direction of the CSB: “What is the one seeking? Godly offspring.” But leaving “the one” unspecified may make the phrase unintelligible or confusing to the average reader. We suggest that the likely options be spelled out, one in the text and one in a footnote. The word **הָאֱלֹהִים** could refer to God, recalling **אֱלֹהֵי אֲנִי** in verse 10. Or, it could refer to the marriage union, recalling **וְהָיָה** at the beginning of the verse.

As for the pronoun to be included in verse 15a, we see no reason to prefer the English pronoun “them,” as in CSB. Verses 13 and 14 have the pronoun “you” (mpl), which also is the pronoun in 15b. It would make sense to assume the same pronoun in the intervening phrase in 15a.

With these changes, though far from certain, the CSB will present a clear, edifying thought—something in harmony with the rest of the Bible.

**Translation Suggestion for the CSB
From the WELS Translation Liaison Committee
May 2019**

Bible References:

Acts 1:16; 3:22; 6:3; 7:37; 15:7, 13 (and perhaps other passages)

Original text:

1:16 – Ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί, ἔδει πληρωθῆναι τὴν γραφὴν ἣν προεῖπε τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον διὰ στόματος Δαυὶδ ...

3:22, 7:37 – Προφήτην ὑμῖν ἀναστήσει ὁ θεὸς ἐκ τῶν ἀδελφῶν ὑμῶν ὡς ἐμέ.

6:3 – ἐπισκέψασθε δέ, ἀδελφοί, ἄνδρας ἐξ ὑμῶν μαρτυρουμένους ἑπτὰ πλήρεις πνεύματος καὶ σοφίας, οὓς καταστήσομεν ἐπὶ τῆς χρείας ταύτης·

15:7 – πολλῆς δὲ ζητήσεως γενομένης ἀναστὰς Πέτρος εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς· Ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί, ὑμεῖς ἐπίστασθε ὅτι ἀφ’ ἡμερῶν ἀρχαίων ἐν ὑμῖν ἐξελέξατο ὁ θεὸς ...

15:13 – μετὰ δὲ τὸ σιγῆσαι αὐτούς ἀπεκρίθη Ἰάκωβος λέγων· Ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί, ἀκούσατέ μου.

CSB rendering:

1:16 – “Brothers and sisters, it was necessary that the Scripture be fulfilled that the Holy Spirit through the mouth of David foretold about Judas, who became a guide to those who arrested Jesus.”

3:22, 7:37 – “**God will raise up for you a prophet like me from among your brothers and sisters.**”

6:3 – “Brothers and sisters, select from among you seven men of good reputation, full of the Spirit and wisdom, whom we can appoint to this duty.”

15:7 – After there had been much debate, Peter stood up and said to them: “Brothers and sisters, you are aware that in the early days God made a choice...”

15:13 – After they stopped speaking, James responded: “Brothers and sisters, listen to me.”

Suggestion:

1:16 – “Brothers, it was necessary that the Scripture be fulfilled that the Holy Spirit through the mouth of David foretold about Judas, who became a guide to those who arrested Jesus.”

3:22, 7:37 – “**God will raise up for you a prophet like me from among your brothers.**”

6:3 – “Brothers, select from among you seven men of good reputation, full of the Spirit and wisdom, whom we can appoint to this duty.”

15:7 – After there had been much debate, Peter stood up and said to them: “Brothers, you are aware that in the early days God made a choice...”

15:13 – After they stopped speaking, James responded: “Brothers, listen to me.”

Rationale:

We regret CSB’s use of “brothers and sisters” in these passages. It is worth noting that CSB’s handling of some of these passages has been mentioned by some pastors in our circles as a reason to consider CSB less than recommendable. A number of factors have led us to suggest changes.

1) While ἀδελφοί by itself can refer to mixed company (“brothers and sisters”), it is by no means to be understood that way automatically. We are happy to see that CSB recognizes this in many passages. In Acts we notice 22 passages in which CSB translates the plural of ἀδελφός as “brothers” without the addition “and sisters” (1:14; 2:37; 7:2; 7:26; 9:30; 10:23; 11:12; 12:17; 13:15; 14:2; 15:1; 15:22; 15:23 [first occurrence]; 17:6; 17:14; 22:1; 22:5; 23:1; 23:5; 23:6; 28:17; 28:21). Among those 22 passages are some (9:30; 12:17; 15:22; 17:6; 17:14; 22:1; 22:5; 28:17; 28:21) in which a translator unconcerned about the distinct roles of men and women in the first century might be eager to impose a gender inclusive translation on the word ἀδελφοί, but CSB uses “brothers.” For example, in Acts 22:1, there were no doubt some women present in the temple courts, but when Paul speaks to the crowd, he uses an androcentric rather than an inclusive form of address, ἄνδρες ἀδελφοὶ καὶ πατέρες, and CSB properly translates “Brothers and fathers.” We applaud CSB’s decision in these passages and suggest that it would be consistent to do something similar in 1:16, 3:22, 6:3, 7:37, and 15:7, 13. As we shall note at the end, there are other ἀνήρ passages in which consistency and accuracy would lead to revisions, but in this recommendation we are highlighting the passages of greatest concern in this connection.

2) In Acts 1:15, Peter gets up in the midst of the ἀδελφῶν. The preceding verse mentioned women as part of the group that was with the apostles, and Luke goes on to number the group at about 120 persons, so it is natural to conclude that the ἀδελφῶν included “brothers and sisters,” as CSB puts it in 1:15. But the presence of women does not mean that Peter feels obliged to address the women when he is seeking input from those who have a voice in the governance of the church, namely the men (cf. 1 Cor 11:3; 14:34,35; 1 Tim 2:11,12). Peter belongs to a culture in which androcentric forms of address when women are present can be entirely appropriate. At Sinai, the men and women of Israel were present, but in the last of the Ten Commandments God himself said, “You shall not covet your neighbor’s wife,” with no corresponding clause addressed to the women (Exod 20:17). Peter can count on it that the women will not take it amiss if he addresses the men, and he makes it very clear that he is doing so by saying not simply ἀδελφοί but ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί.

If it were idiomatic to say, “Gentlemen, brothers,” we might suggest that as the translation here. The use of ἄνδρες as part of a vocative expression shows respect for the men as men. We know of no evidence suggesting that in the first century ἄνδρες in a vocative expression was merely a customary noise or that it was *only* a way of indicating respect (as though ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί addressed to Christians meant nothing more than “esteemed fellow believers”).

There are in fact a few passages in Greek literature in which we find striking vocative combinations such as ἄνδρες ἰχθύες (Archippus, frag. 29, in Athenaeus 7, 331c) or ὃ ἄνδρες κύνες (Athenaeus 4, 160b) or ἄνδρες Τρίτωνες (Timaeus, in Athenaeus 2, 37d) or ἄνδρες θεοί (Lucian, *Iuppiter Tragoedus* 15). But all of these striking juxtapositions occur in humorous passages, and some of their humor depends on the perception that ἄνδρες still has its normal meaning (adult male human beings). The phrase ἄνδρες θεοί occurs in a piece by Lucian of Samosata, who lived in the second century AD, i.e., well after the time of the apostles. Our assumption that Luke’s use of the vocative ἄνδρες is still in line with the long established and most common meaning of the word is thus confirmed by the exploitation of that meaning by Lucian and others for the sake of comedy.

It is true that Chrysostom was of the opinion that Peter in Acts 1:16 was addressing both the men and the women, but his homily on this passage offers no philological justification for his view. He has no explicit comment on Luke's use of ἄνδρες here. Perhaps by Chrysostom's time the word had lost all distinctive meaning when used in the vocative. Such an evolution in meaning need not take long and could have taken place between the careers of Lucian and Chrysostom. (In our own lifetime "guys" has evolved in English from a strictly male designation to one that can be used by a woman addressing other women.) The only thing that Chrysostom offers by way of rationale for his view sounds like a theological argument based on Galatians 3:28—a lame exegesis that would, if it were valid, make it impossible for Paul to say what he says about men and women in 1 Corinthians and 1 Timothy. In any case, Chrysostom is too late to serve as convincing evidence that ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί in Acts 1:16 is meant to include the women when so much evidence closer to apostolic times indicates that Peter is addressing the men.

3) That being the case, ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί in Acts 15:7 and 15:13 should also be translated "brothers," not "brothers and sisters." Here we have additional contextual evidence for our conclusion. Luke has set the stage for our understanding of the Jerusalem Council by telling us that "the apostles and elders" gathered to discuss the issues (15:6). With no indication of a new session on a later day with a larger body of participants, Luke tells us in 15:7 that after much debate, Peter got up and made his speech, addressing himself to the group he calls ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί. There has been no indication that women were present. If some were present as observers, Peter need not have addressed them. The same is true of James's use of ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί in verse 13. The later reference to the πλῆθος (15:20) need not imply that the whole Christian community (thousands of believers!) was present. If Luke can use the word πλῆθος to refer to a meeting of the Sanhedrin (Acts 23:7), he can use it to refer to a sizeable gathering of the apostles, the elders of the Jerusalem church, Paul, Barnabas, and the other representatives of the church in Antioch. At some point the Jerusalem church expressed its agreement with the decision reached by the apostles and elders, but the church would have done so by the voices of men who represented the church, not by seeking out the opinions of every last man, woman, and child. In any case, the church as a whole is not being addressed in 15:7 and 13. In those passages Peter and James use ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί to address the other leaders who have gathered to discuss the matter, and those leaders were men.

4) In Acts 6:2 the Twelve summon τὸ πλῆθος τῶν μαθητῶν to hear and act upon their proposal for a new office in the church. We should not imagine that the Christians had a convention hall with room for every man, woman, and child in the Jerusalem church, nor was there any need for input from all of them. Luke has already made it clear in Acts 1 that matters of this kind are for the men to deal with (ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί). In Acts 6:3 Peter uses only the vocative ἀδελφοί, but under the circumstances it is natural to understand this as an address to the men and to translate accordingly, "brothers."

5) Peter's speech in Acts 3:12-26 is focused on Christ, and thus the use of the word for "prophet" in the singular ("God will raise up a prophet for you") is best understood in this context as a pointed prophecy of the sending of Christ. Whatever applicability Deuteronomy 18:15 had to lesser prophets in Old Testament times, Jesus is in a unique sense a prophet comparable to Moses ("like me"). Moses was the mediator of the old covenant and the greatest prophet of Old Testament times; Jesus is the mediator of the new covenant and the greatest of all prophets. Deuteronomy 34:10 tells us, "No prophet has arisen again in Israel *like Moses*, whom the LORD knew face to face." In line with this understanding of Deuteronomy 18:15 as pointing to a unique figure, we find evidence for an expectation of "the prophet" in John 1:21. It is also noteworthy that Peter in Acts 3 follows up his quotation of Deuteronomy 18:15 with a heightened declaration of the punishment awaiting anyone who rejects *this* prophet, Jesus. These thoughts would be well served by translating "from among your brothers" in Acts 3:22; by contrast, "from among your brothers and sisters" blurs the focus on Christ. Some readers of the latter translation may even leap to the unwarranted and unprofitable conclusion, "So, in Old Testament times, people could have been expecting the Messiah to be either a man or a woman!" Happily, the CSB translation at Deuteronomy 18:15 is

simply “from among your own brothers” (with no addition of “and sisters”), but it would be good to omit “and sisters” from the translation of Acts 3:22 as well.

6) The translation decision that best fits the context in Acts 3:22 should be followed also in Acts 7:37. We have every reason to assume that Luke has the same understanding of Deuteronomy 18:15 in both passages.

7) Those who see in the Bible a divine teaching of distinct roles for men and women will not be surprised or embarrassed by the androcentric expressions that occur in the Bible. Translators do well to respect these expressions and reflect them in their translations. While the aforementioned passages are of greatest concern to us, consistency would suggest the following revisions as well. The vocative phrase ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί occurs also in Acts 2:29, 13:26, and 13:38. In each instance, CSB has “brothers and sisters,” but “brothers” would more accurately reflect the androcentric mode of address. The vocative ἄνδρες is used in combination with national and civic designations in a number of passages. At Acts 2:14 one could translate ἄνδρες Ἰουδαῖοι as “Men of Judea” instead of CSB’s “Fellow Jews,” and at Acts 2:22, 3:12, 13:16, and 21:28 ἄνδρες Ἰσραηλῖται could become “Men of Israel” instead of CSB’s “Fellow Israelites.” At Acts 17:22 ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι would be “Men of Athens,” not “People of Athens” (surely we have no reason to suppose that the Areopagus Council included women), and at Acts 19:35 ἄνδρες Ἐφέσιοι would be “Men of Ephesus,” not “People of Ephesus.” An androcentric focus in public events comes so naturally to Luke that as he narrates the events of Pentecost, he notes that the Jews in Jerusalem at that time included “devout men (ἄνδρες) from every nation under heaven” (CSB has “devout people...”).

**Translation Suggestion for the CSB
From the WELS Translation Liaison Committee
May 2019**

Bible Reference:

Romans 2:14

Original text:

ὅταν γὰρ ἔθνη τὰ μὴ νόμον ἔχοντα φύσει τὰ τοῦ νόμου ποιῶσιν, οὗτοι νόμον μὴ ἔχοντες ἑαυτοῖς εἰσιν νόμος

CSB rendering:

So, when Gentiles, who do not by nature have the law, do what the law demands, they are a law to themselves even though they do not have the law.

Suggestion:

So, when Gentiles, who do not have the law, do by nature what the law demands, they are a law to themselves even though they do not have the law.

Rationale:

There are a number of reasons φύσει should be taken as modifying ποιῶσιν, “Gentiles...do by nature what the law demands” (not as modifying ἔχοντα, “Gentiles, who do not by nature have the law”).

1. There is no need for taking φύσει with ἔχοντα. “Gentiles, who do not have the law,” is clear by itself. This is confirmed by the rest of the verse, where οὗτοι νόμον μὴ ἔχοντες occurs without φύσει.
2. With either construction one can understand φύσει in a sense consistent with Paul’s most common way of using the word, i.e., to refer to a person’s condition as determined by birth. But taking the word with ποιῶσιν leads to a more fruitful set of reflections than taking it with ἔχοντα.
 - a. CSB follows the latter construction, which leads us to these thoughts: Gentiles were not born into a community that inculcated in them the law of Moses. By implication, Jews were born into such a community and were taught the law of Moses as a result. But it is not as though a Jew possessed the Mosaic law in a meaningful way just by being born, and so one wonders why Paul would highlight nature or birth to indicate why the Gentiles do not have the Mosaic law. If there were a need to explain that point, Paul could have zeroed in on the most relevant factor by saying that Gentiles did not have that law by virtue of their upbringing or education or heritage. But as already noted, the fact that the Gentiles do not have the Mosaic law is clear enough without φύσει or any other addition.
 - b. The other construction, followed by most translators, yields a precise point that is directly relevant to the very assertion Paul is working toward. “Gentiles...do by nature what the law says” steers the reader away from any thought of a merely human transmission of merely human discoveries about how to get along with others. If Gentiles do these things by nature, it is because God, the creator of human nature, has embedded a special feature within human nature. At birth people have the seeds of a capacity to recognize God’s moral teaching as having authority; that

teaching takes shape in the minds of growing children as imperatives that are not easily silenced. Without that feature of human nature, we could observe other people, listen to their teaching, and apply logic to what we learn without ever arriving at moral imperatives. No syllogism can derive an imperative conclusion from premises in the indicative³; and if we are told to start with the imperatives of our parents and teachers as premises, the whole enterprise becomes a *petitio principii* without convincing power—unless human nature has a God-given capacity to recognize the authority of his moral imperatives and to reject their opposites. That capacity is weakened since Adam’s fall, so that the natural knowledge of God’s law is not perfect, and it can be further eroded by external pressures (e.g., educational or societal influence) and by the individual’s sinful choices. Paul does not say that all the Gentiles do all of God’s moral will all the time. Nonetheless, Paul perceives that Gentiles *by nature* do what the law demands. Articulating that point makes it possible for him to go on to say the very thing he wants to say: Gentiles do not merely *have* a non-Mosaic version of God’s law, but they *are* that for themselves and as such are answerable to God. If Paul had simply said that the Gentiles do what the law demands, a reader might wonder, “Do the Gentiles do these things merely to please other Gentiles and get ahead in life? Is it merely a coincidence when their actions correspond to God’s commands?” But if we see “by nature” as part of that statement, we see what God has done to make his commands evident, and thus we see also why the Gentiles are truly accountable to him.

3. There is a pattern to Paul’s sentence that is more strongly fulfilled when φύσει is taken as modifying ποιῶσιν. The pattern becomes apparent if we arrange the subordinate and main clauses on separate lines and use spaces to separate the subject phrases from their predicates:

ὅταν γὰρ	ἔθνη τὰ μὴ νόμον ἔχοντα	φύσει τὰ τοῦ νόμου ποιῶσιν,
	οὗτοι νόμον μὴ ἔχοντες	ἑαυτοῖς εἰσιν νόμος.

In both lines the participle of ἔχω is followed by a dative, and the dative is ambiguous on a purely grammatical level. In the main clause, we could entertain the translation, “these, although not having a law for themselves, are a law.” But we get superior sense and style if we take ἑαυτοῖς with what follows: “...are a law to themselves.” In the subordinate clause likewise we get better sense by taking φύσει with what follows, and now the two clauses together show better balance and parallelism than if we take φύσει with ἔχοντα.

Paul can afford to place these datives in a grammatically ambiguous position only if there is a clear perception that the superior sense of one of the two constructions effectively eliminates the ambiguity. In Romans 2:14 taking φύσει with ποιῶσιν produces better sense and better parallel structure. Under these circumstances, if Paul had wanted φύσει to modify ἔχοντα, he would have needed to place φύσει before the participle.

³ Cf. C. S. Lewis, *The Abolition of Man* (New York: Macmillan Paperback Edition, 1965), in which Lewis highlights the inconsistency of those who reject moral principles as devoid of authority but then promote their own value system: “The Innovator is trying to get a conclusion in the imperative mood out of premisses in the indicative mood: and though he continues trying to all eternity he cannot succeed, for the thing is impossible” (pp. 43-44). “It is the old dilemma. Either the premisses already concealed an imperative or the conclusion remains merely in the indicative” (p. 49).

**Translation Suggestion for the CSB
From the WELS Translation Liaison Committee
May 2019**

Bible Reference:

1 Corinthians 7:1

Original text:

Περὶ δὲ ὧν ἐγράψατε, καλὸν ἀνθρώπῳ γυναικὸς μὴ ἅπτεσθαι·

CSB rendering:

Now in response to the matters you wrote about: “It is good for a man not to use* a woman for sex.”

*Lit “It is good for a man not to touch a woman”

Suggestion:

Now in response to the matters you wrote about: It is good for a man not to have sexual contact with a woman.

Rationale:

Our chief criticism here is that CSB’s “use a woman for sex” has strong negative connotations. The phrase suggests that the man is exploiting the woman and reducing her to a sex object for the selfish gratification of his desires. As far as we know, the Greek expression does not in itself express those connotations, nor does the present context suggest such a limitation of the scope of Paul’s expression.

It is often observed by commentators on this verse that the Greek for “touch a woman” is a euphemism for sexual intercourse (e.g., Fee, Fitzmyer, Schrage, and Zeller). Sexual intercourse can take place in a loving and respectful way within marriage, and it can take place in exploitive, degrading, and illicit ways. BDAG (s.v. ἅπτω 4) cites Plato *Laws* 8, 840a, where an athlete in training is said not to have touched a woman or boy. There the expression has nothing to do with whether his sexual activity would have been lawful and respectful and everything to do with his refusal to impair his strength by sexual intercourse of any kind.

Paul uses the euphemism to indicate that celibate self-control is a good way to live. He doesn’t need to prove the point; Jesus lived a celibate life, and Paul himself is living in celibacy. He mentions it briefly to affirm some common ground with Corinthian Christians who are keen on celibacy, before he goes on to dismantle the over-reaching ways in which they promoted a life without sex (e.g., their encouragement to married people to stop having sex, their efforts to discourage persons without the gift of celibate self-control from getting married, their suggestion of divorce as a way to achieve celibacy). Paul’s words in verse 1 become problematical only when people ignore what he goes on to say in the rest of the chapter and when they read into verse 1 things that Paul doesn’t actually say. Paul doesn’t say that celibacy is a good choice for *everyone*, or that it is the *only* good way to live, or that it is *morally better* for a Christian to be celibate than to be married, or that sexual intercourse is *inherently bad*.

There is nothing in the context to suggest that in verse 1, Paul wants to restrict the notion of touching a woman sexually to exploitive, degrading kinds of sexual activity. He values his own celibacy because it is advantageous for his undivided, undistracted devotion to the Lord, and that means he affirms as good not

only his refraining from exploitive, degrading sex but also his refraining from marriage and the honorable sexual activity that is normally part of marriage.

The translation “use a woman for sex” is contextually problematical for another reason as well. One of the most obvious ways of using a woman for sex is to use a prostitute. But Paul has already dealt with that sin in chapter 6, and now at 7:1 he is clearly moving on to a distinct set of issues. In chapter 6 we see that some of the Corinthian men were entertaining the thought that sex with prostitutes was an adiaphoron, but in chapter 7 Paul responds to other Corinthians who thought that sex of any kind was to be avoided. Paul carefully recommends celibacy for persons like himself who are single and equipped with the gift of sexual self-control while upholding the validity of marriage and the importance of sex within marriage for those who are not equipped for celibate self-control. None of the foregoing suggests that Paul in verse 1 is talking only about the kind of sexual touching that amounts to *using* a woman in an exploitive or degrading way.

Scholars argue about whether the latter part of verse 1 is Paul’s quotation of a Corinthian statement or his own formulation. The hypothesis of a quotation is unnecessary here, and so we would prefer to omit the quotation marks. In view of verse 8, where Paul is clearly affirming a point similar to the one made in verse 1, there is no need to put distance between Paul and the contents of verse 1, as long as one does not read more into verse 1 than it actually says.

Our main concern is that the notion of *using a woman* should be removed from CSB’s translation of this verse. A variety of replacements would be acceptable to us, whether they are more literal in reproducing Paul’s tactful euphemism or more explicit in bringing out the sexual nature of the touching. We are recommending Mounce’s translation, which straddles the fence. The word “contact” reflects Paul’s ἅπτεσθαι, and “sexual” steers modern readers away from concerns about harmless touching such as shaking hands or accidentally bumping into a woman in a crowd. The suggested translation eliminates any need for a footnote on the translation of ἅπτεσθαι.

Translation Suggestion for the CSB
From the WELS Translation Liaison Committee
May 2019

Bible Reference:

Hebrews 11:2

Original text:

ἐν ταύτῃ γὰρ ἐμαρτυρήθησαν οἱ πρεσβύτεροι.

CSB rendering:

For by it our ancestors won God’s approval.

Suggestion:

For by it our ancestors received God’s approval.

Rationale:

The translation “won” locates the reason for God’s “approval” in some achievement on the part of the “ancestors,” which the text does not. This translation suggests that the faith of Enoch, Noah, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob was a good work that earned or merited God’s favor—as if God was not really eager to show approval, but the faith of the ancestors won him over.

In our opinion, a simple way to improve the rendering would be to use the word “received” instead. This translation represents the text more accurately by making the “ancestors” the experiencers, not the agents, when God confers his “approval.” In addition, it better reflects the relationship between God and mankind in general. If people have God’s approval, it is not something they have achieved by their own efforts, but rather something they have received as a gift. Indeed, faith itself is a gift of grace worked by the Holy Spirit (Eph 2:8-9, 1 Cor 12:3, 2 Thes 2:13).

**Translation Suggestion for the CSB
From the WELS Translation Liaison Committee
May 2019**

Issue:

In the OT passages that refer to a “homer,” the CSB consistently calculates a homer as five bushels. However, on the “Table of Weights and Measures” at the end of the CSB, a homer is listed as “6 bushels.”

CSB rendering:

Num 11:32 – The people were up all that day and night and all the next day gathering the quail—the one who took the least gathered fifty bushels*—and they spread them out all around the camp.

* Lit 10 homers

Lev 27:16 – “If a man consecrates to the LORD any part of a field that he possesses, your assessment of value will be proportional to the seed needed to sow it, at the rate of fifty silver shekels for every five bushels* of barley seed.

* Lit for a homer

Ezek 45:11 – The dry measure and the liquid measure will be uniform, with the liquid measure containing 5½ gallons and the dry measure holding half a bushel.*

* Lit one-tenth of a homer

Ezek 45:13 – “This is the contribution you are to offer: Three quarts from five bushels* of wheat and three quarts from five bushels of barley.

* Lit a homer

Table of Weights and Measures: Homer = 6 bushels

Suggestion:

Somehow we would suggest making these references consistent. Would it work to indicate on your chart that a “homer” is “5-6 bushels”? How certain are you that a “homer” was 5 bushels and not 6? We hesitate to make a firm suggestion, because we don’t know what all the implications might be. But we suggest that someone take a look at this.

Translation Suggestion for the CSB
From the WELS Translation Liaison Committee
May 2019

Bible Reference:

Exodus 10:10

Original text:

וַיֹּאמֶר אֲלֵהֶם יְהוָה בְּנֵהוּ עִמָּכֶם כַּאֲשֶׁר אֲשַׁלַּח אֶתְכֶם וְאֶת־טַפְּכֶם רְאוּ כִי רָעָה גִגַּד פְּנֵיכֶם:

CSB rendering:

He said to them, “The Lord would have to be with you if I would ever let you and your families go! Look out—you’re heading for trouble.

Suggestion:

He said to them, “The LORD would have to be with you if I would ever let you and your families go! Look out—you’re heading for trouble.

Rationale:

Perhaps this typo has already been caught (we have seen it correct online), but our printed Bibles have “Lord” where they should have “LORD.”

Translation Suggestion for the CSB
From the WELS Translation Liaison Committee
May 2019

Bible Reference:

Leviticus 16:8

Original text:

וַנִּתֵּן אֶהָרֹן עַל־שְׁנֵי הַשְּׂעִירִים גּוֹרְלוֹת גּוֹרֵל אֶחָד לַיהוָה וְגּוֹרֵל אֶחָד לְעִזָּאֵל:

CSB rendering:

After Aaron casts lots for the two goats, one lot for the LORD and the other for an uninhabitable place,^{A,B}

^A Lit for *Azazel*, also in vv. 10 (2x), 26

^B Perhaps a term that means “for the goat that departs,” or “for removal,” or “for a rough, difficult place,” or “for a goat demon”; Hb obscure, also in vv. 10,26

Suggestion:

After Aaron casts lots for the two goats, one lot for the LORD and the other for an uninhabitable place,^{A,B}

^A Lit for *Azazel*, also in vv. 10 (2x), 26

^B Traditionally “for the scapegoat”; perhaps a term that means “for the goat that departs,” or “for removal,” or “for a rough, difficult place,” or “for a goat demon”; Hb obscure, also in vv. 10,26

Rationale:

Many readers in our circles are used to and appreciate the translation “scapegoat” for עִזָּאֵל in Leviticus 16. We think it would be helpful if the CSB would include the traditional rendering in its explanatory footnote.

**Translation Suggestion for the CSB
From the WELS Translation Liaison Committee
May 2019**

Bible Reference:

Numbers 10:29

Original text:

וַיֹּאמֶר מֹשֶׁה לְחֹבָב בֶּן־רְעוּאֵל הַמִּדְיָנִי חָתָן מֹשֶׁה נֹסְעִים אֲנִי וְאֶל־הַמָּקוֹם אֲשֶׁר אָמַר יְהוָה אֵתוֹ לָכֶם לָכֶּה אֲתֹנֶנּוּ וְהִטַּבְנוּ לָךְ כִּי־יְהִיגָה דְבַר־טוֹב עַל־יִשְׂרָאֵל:

CSB rendering:

Moses said to Hobab, descendant of Reuel the Midianite and Moses’s relative by marriage: Reuel the Midianite: “We’re setting out for the place the LORD promised: ‘I will give it to you.’ Come with us, and we will treat you well, for the LORD has promised good things to Israel.”

Suggestion:

Moses said to Hobab, descendant of Reuel the Midianite and Moses’s relative by marriage: “We’re setting out for the place the LORD promised: ‘I will give it to you.’ Come with us, and we will treat you well, for the LORD has promised good things to Israel.”

Rationale:

We know that there is debate about the identity of Hobab, but we see no reason for the clumsy insertion of “Reuel the Midianite:” into this verse, with no support in the Hebrew text.

**Translation Suggestion for the CSB
From the WELS Translation Liaison Committee
May 2019**

Bible Reference:

Deuteronomy 1:39

Original text:

וְטַפְכֶם אֲשֶׁר אָמַרְתֶּם לְבָז יִהְיֶה וּבְנֵיכֶם אֲשֶׁר לֹא־יָדְעוּ הַיּוֹם טוֹב וְרָע הִמָּה יָבֹאוּ שָׂמָּה וְלָקְּחָם אֶת־הָאָרֶץ וְהָם יִרְשׁוּהָ:

CSB rendering:

Your children, whom you said would be plunder, your sons who don't yet know good from evil, will enter there. I will give them the land, and they will take possession of it.

Suggestion:

Your children, who you said would be plunder, your sons who don't yet know good from evil, will enter there. I will give them the land, and they will take possession of it.

Rationale:

Technically, the relative pronoun in the first relative clause is the subject of the verb “would be plunder,” so it should be “who” and not “whom.”

Translation Suggestion for the CSB
From the WELS Translation Liaison Committee
May 2019

Bible Reference:

Deuteronomy 2:7

Original text:

כִּי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ בָּרַכְךָ בְּכֹל מַעֲשֵׂה יָדְךָ יָנַע לְקִתְּךָ אֶת־הַמִּדְבָּר הַגָּדֹל הַזֶּה וְהוּא אֲרַבְעִים שָׁנָה יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ
עִמָּךְ לֹא חָסַרְתָּ דָבָר:

CSB rendering:

For the LORD your God has blessed you in all the work of your hands. He has watched over your journey through this immense wilderness. The LORD your God has been with you this past forty years, and you have lacked nothing.’

Suggestion:

For the LORD your God has blessed you in all the work of your hands. He has watched over your journey through this immense wilderness. The LORD your God has been with you these past forty years, and you have lacked nothing.’

Rationale:

Hebrew has a singular demonstrative pronoun הַזֶּה and the forty years could be conceived as a unit, but we think that normal English style requires a plural demonstrative in this expression (= these forty years). We notice that the same Hebrew expression occurs in Deuteronomy 8:2 and 8:4 (וְהוּא אֲרַבְעִים שָׁנָה), and in those passages the CSB has “these forty years.”

Translation Suggestion for the CSB
From the WELS Translation Liaison Committee
May 2019

Bible Reference:

Judges 9:31

Original text:

וַיִּשְׁלַח מְלָאכִים אֶל-אַבִּימֶלֶךְ בְּתַרְמֻמָּה לֵאמֹר הִנֵּה גַעַל בֶּן-עֶבֶד וְאֶחָיו בָּאִים שָׂמָּה וְהַנֶּם צָרִים אֶת-הָעִיר
עָלֶיךָ:

CSB rendering:

So he secretly sent messengers to Abimelech, saying, “Beware! Gaal son of Ebed, with his brothers, have come to Shechem and are turning the city against you.

Suggestion:

So he secretly sent messengers to Abimelech, saying, “Beware! Gaal son of Ebed and his brothers have come to Shechem and are turning the city against you.

Rationale:

In this phrase—“Gaal son of Ebed, with his brothers, have come”—the CSB technically does not have agreement between the subject and the verb. Grammatically, it should be “has come” since Gaal is the subject. Perhaps the easiest way to fix the problem is to make a compound subject, and then to leave the verbs plural. That, actually, is how the Hebrew is expressed, since “Gaal” and “his brothers” are connected with the copula and not with a preposition, and the verbs are plural.

Translation Suggestion for the CSB
From the WELS Translation Liaison Committee
May 2019

Bible Reference:

Judges 13:18

Original text:

וַיֹּאמֶר לוֹ מַלְאָךְ יְהוָה לָמָּה זֶה תִּשְׁאַל לְשְׁמִי וְהוּא־כֹּלְאִי:

CSB rendering:

“Why do you ask my name,” the angel of the LORD asked him, “since it is beyond understanding.”

Suggestion:

“Why do you ask my name,” the angel of the LORD asked him, “since it is beyond understanding?”

Rationale:

It seems that there should be a question mark at the end of this question. Another option would be to break the sentence into two: “Why do you ask my name?” the angel of the LORD asked him. “It is beyond understanding.”

Translation Suggestion for the CSB
From the WELS Translation Liaison Committee
May 2019

Bible Reference:

1 Samuel 6:18b

Original text:

וְעַד אֲבֵל הַגְּדוּלָה אֲשֶׁר הִנִּיחוּ עָלֶיהָ אֶת אֲרוֹן יְהוָה עַד הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה בְּשָׂדֵה יְהוֹשֻׁעַ בֵּית־הַשְּׁמֶשֶׁת׃

CSB rendering:

The large rock* on which the ark of the LORD was placed is still in the field of Joshua of Beth-shemesh today.

* Some Hb mss, DSS, LXX, Tg; other Hb mss read *meadow*

Suggestion:

The large rock* on which the ark of the LORD was placed is still in the field of Joshua of Beth-shemesh today.

* Some Hb mss, LXX, Tg; other Hb mss read *meadow*

Rationale:

This variant reading does not actually appear in the Dead Sea Scrolls. In the Oxford transcription of 4QSam^a, the word אֲבֵן appears, rather than אֲבֵל. But the word is in a lacuna, so it is supplied by the editor. The word אֲבֵן is not present in the DSS fragment (see *Discoveries in the Judaean Wilderness XVII*, 55-56).

**Translation Suggestion for the CSB
From the WELS Translation Liaison Committee
May 2019**

Bible References:

1 Kings 8:13
2 Chronicles 6:2

Original text:

1 Ki 8:13 – בָּנָה בְּנִיתִי בַיִת זֶבֶל לַיהוָה מְכוֹן לְשִׁבְתָּהּ עוֹלָמִים:
2 Chr 6:2 – וְאַנִּי בְּנִיתִי בַיִת זֶבֶל לַיהוָה וּמְכוֹן לְשִׁבְתָּהּ עוֹלָמִים:

CSB rendering:

1 Ki 8:13 – I have indeed built an exalted temple for you,
a place for your dwelling forever.
2 Chr 6:2 – but I have built an exalted temple for you,
a place for your residence forever.

Suggestion:

1 Ki 8:13 – I have indeed built an exalted temple for you,
a place for your dwelling forever.
2 Chr 6:2 – but I have built an exalted temple for you,
a place for your dwelling forever.

Rationale:

When there are parallel passages with identical wording in the original, we expect that a polished English translation will have identical translations. We suggest making the parallel passages identical here.

**Translation Suggestion for the CSB
From the WELS Translation Liaison Committee
May 2019**

Bible References:

1 Kings 8:25
2 Chronicles 6:16

Original text:

1 Ki 8:25 – לא־יִפְרֹת לְךָ אִישׁ מִלְּפָנַי יוֹשֵׁב עַל־כִּסֵּא יִשְׂרָאֵל רַק אִם־יִשְׁמְרוּ בְנֶיךָ אֶת־דִּרְכָּם לִלְכֹת לְפָנַי כַּאֲשֶׁר הִלַּכְתָּ לְפָנָי:

2 Chr 6:16 – לא־יִפְרֹת לְךָ אִישׁ מִלְּפָנַי יוֹשֵׁב עַל־כִּסֵּא יִשְׂרָאֵל רַק אִם־יִשְׁמְרוּ בְנֶיךָ אֶת־דִּרְכָּם לִלְכֹת בְּתוֹרָתִי כַּאֲשֶׁר הִלַּכְתָּ לְפָנָי:

CSB rendering:

1 Ki 8:25 – You will never fail to have a man
to sit before me on the throne of Israel,
if only your sons take care to walk before me
as you have walked before me.

2 Chr 6:16 – “You will never fail to have a man
to sit before me on the throne of Israel,
if only your sons guard their way to walk in my Law
as you have walked before me.”

Suggestion:

1 Ki 8:25 – You will never fail to have a man
to sit before me on the throne of Israel,
if only your sons guard their way to walk before me
as you have walked before me.

2 Chr 6:16 – “You will never fail to have a man
to sit before me on the throne of Israel,
if only your sons guard their way to walk in my Law
as you have walked before me.”

Rationale:

This consistency issue in the same chapter was also flagged by our WELS reviewer. We notice that the same expression occurs in 1 Ki 2:4, and there the CSB has “guard their way.”

**Translation Suggestion for the CSB
From the WELS Translation Liaison Committee
May 2019**

Bible References:

1 Kings 10:1
2 Chronicles 9:1

Original text:

1 Ki 10:1 – ומלכת־שְׁבָא שָׁמְעָה אֶת־שְׁמֵעַ שְׁלֹמֹה לְשֵׁם יְהוָה וַתָּבֹא לְנִסְתּוֹ בְּחִידוֹת: .
2 Chr 9:1 – ומלכת־שְׁבָא שָׁמְעָה אֶת־שְׁמֵעַ שְׁלֹמֹה לְנִסְתּוֹ אֶת־שְׁלֹמֹה בְּחִידוֹת בִּירוּשָׁלַם בְּחִיל כְּבֹד –
מְאֹד וְגַמְלִים נִשְׂאִים בְּשִׁמְיָם וְזָהָב לָרֹב וְאַבְנֵי יָקָרָה

CSB rendering:

1 Ki 10:1 – The queen of Sheba heard about Solomon’s fame connected with the name of the LORD and came to test him with riddles.
2 Chr 9:1 – The queen of Sheba heard of Solomon’s fame, so she came to test Solomon with difficult questions at Jerusalem with a very large entourage, with camels bearing spices, gold in abundance, and precious stones.

Suggestion:

1 Ki 10:1 – The queen of Sheba heard about Solomon’s fame connected with the name of the LORD and came to test him with difficult questions.
2 Chr 9:1 – The queen of Sheba heard of Solomon’s fame, so she came to test Solomon with difficult questions at Jerusalem with a very large entourage, with camels bearing spices, gold in abundance, and precious stones.

Rationale:

Here is another consistency issue that is quite noticeable. The parallel passages have the same Hebrew word (בְּחִידוֹת), so we would expect the same English equivalent in the two passages.

Translation Suggestion for the CSB
From the WELS Translation Liaison Committee
May 2019

Bible Reference:

1 Kings 16:10

Original text:

וַיִּבֹא זִמְרִי וַיִּכְהוּ וַיִּמְלֹתְהוּ בִּשְׁנַת עֶשְׂרִים וְשִׁבְעָה לְאַסָּא מֶלֶךְ יְהוּדָה וַיִּמְלֹךְ פַּחְחִיו:

CSB rendering:

In the twenty-seventh year of Judah’s King Asa, Zimri went in, struck Elah down, killing him. Then Zimri became king in his place.

Suggestion:

In the twenty-seventh year of Judah’s King Asa, Zimri went in and struck Elah down, killing him. Then Zimri became king in his place.

Rationale:

It seems odd that the conjunction “and” is not included to join the two verbs.

**Translation Suggestion for the CSB
From the WELS Translation Liaison Committee
May 2019**

Bible Reference:

2 Chronicles 2:18 (H 17)

Original text:

וַיַּעַשׂ מֵהֶם שְׁבַע־עֶשְׂרִים אֶלֶף סָפֵל וְשִׁמְנֵימֵן אֶלֶף חֲצַיִב בְּהָר וּשְׁלֹשָׁת אֶלְפִים וְשֵׁשׁ מֵאוֹת מְנַצְחִים לְהַעֲבִיד אֶת־
הָעָם:

CSB rendering:

Solomon made 70,000 of them porters, 80,000 stonecutters in the mountains, and 36,000 supervisors to make the people work.

Suggestion:

Solomon made 70,000 of them porters, 80,000 stonecutters in the mountains, and 3,600 supervisors to make the people work.

Rationale:

Perhaps this typo has already been caught (we have seen it correct online), but our printed Bibles have “36,000” where they should have “3,600.”

**Translation Suggestion for the CSB
From the WELS Translation Liaison Committee
May 2019**

Bible Reference:

Psalm 62:12 (H 13)

Original text:

וּלְדָאֲדָגִי תְקַדְּ כִּי־אַתָּה תְּשַׁלֵּם לְאִישׁ כְּמַעֲשָׂהוּ:

CSB rendering:

and faithful love belongs to you, LORD.
For you repay each according to his works.

Suggestion:

and faithful love belongs to you, Lord.
For you repay each according to his works.

Rationale:

Perhaps this typo has already been caught (we have seen it correct online), but our printed Bibles have “LORD” where they should have “Lord.”

**Translation Suggestion for the CSB
From the WELS Translation Liaison Committee
May 2019**

Bible Reference:

Psalm 100:1

Original text:

הָרִיעוּ לַיהוָה כָּל־הָאָרֶץ

CSB rendering:

Let the whole earth shout triumphantly to God!

Suggestion:

Let the whole earth shout triumphantly to the LORD!

Rationale:

Perhaps this typo has already been caught (we have seen it correct online), but our printed Bibles have “God” where they should have “the LORD.”

**Translation Suggestion for the CSB
From the WELS Translation Liaison Committee
May 2019**

Bible Reference:

Proverbs 27:3-4

Original text:

כָּבֵד־אֶבֶן וְנֹטֶל הַחֹל וְכַעַס אֵוִיל כְּכֵד מִשְׁנִינֵהֶם:
אֲכַזְרִיּוֹת חַמָּה וְשֹׂטָף אַף וְיָמִי יַעֲמֵד לְפָנַי קִנְיָה:

CSB rendering:

³A stone is heavy and sand, a burden,
but aggravation from a fool outweighs them both.

⁴Fury is cruel, and anger a flood,
but who can withstand jealousy?

Suggestion:

³A stone is heavy, and sand a burden,
but aggravation from a fool outweighs them both.

⁴Fury is cruel, and anger a flood,
but who can withstand jealousy?

Rationale:

The way the first part of each verse is punctuated differs between verse 3 and verse 4, but the structuring of the thoughts is the same. To make the punctuation consistent, we suggest moving the comma in verse 3.

Translation Suggestion for the CSB
From the WELS Translation Liaison Committee
May 2019

Bible Reference:

Ecclesiastes 1:5

Original text:

וַיִּזְרַח הַשֶּׁמֶשׁ וַיָּבֵא הַשֶּׁמֶשׁ אֶל-מְקוֹמוֹ שֶׁזָּרַח זֹרַח הוּא שָׁם:

CSB rendering:

The sun rises and the sun sets; panting, it returns to the place where it rises.

Suggestion:

The sun rises and the sun sets; panting, it hurries back to the place where it rises.

Rationale:

The Hebrew root פָּאַץ appears fourteen times in the Old Testament. The CSB translates in one of two general ways: *trample* or *pant* (with related English words *long*, *gasp* and *sniff*). The picture in Ecclesiastes 1:5 seems to be of a runner who is hurrying along, exerting himself to reach his goal. Similarly, after the sun goes down in the west, it hurries back to the east, where it rises again. When the reader gives some thought to the picture, he can understand the image of the sun panting. Yet the image of the sun panting with exhaustion might strike many readers in English as strange. So we suggest an option that almost all English translations have chosen in some form (with the English words *hurry* or *hasten*), which emphasizes the action that causes the panting.

**Translation Suggestion for the CSB
From the WELS Translation Liaison Committee
May 2019**

Bible Reference:

Isaiah 6:8

Original text:

וְאֶשְׁמַע אֶת־קוֹל אֲדֹנָי אֹמֵר אֶת־מִי אֶשְׁלַח וּמִי יֵלֶךְ־לִנִּי

CSB rendering:

Then I heard the voice of the Lord asking:

Who should I send?

Who will go for us?

Suggestion:

Then I heard the voice of the Lord asking:

Whom should I send?

Who will go for us?

Rationale:

We realize that there is debate on whether “whom” in this syntactic environment is going away. The context here, however, suggests a formal language register, so we recommend following the traditional rule. Since the first interrogative pronoun is the direct object of a verb, the preferred English form is “whom” and not “who.”

**Translation Suggestion for the CSB
From the WELS Translation Liaison Committee
May 2019**

Bible References:

Jeremiah 49:9
Obadiah 5

Original text:

Jer 49:9 – אַם־בְּצָרִים בָּאוּ לְךָ לֹא יִשְׁאַרוּ עֹלְלוֹת

Obad 5 – אַם־בְּצָרִים בָּאוּ לְךָ הֲלוֹא יִשְׁאַרוּ עֹלְלוֹת:

CSB rendering:

Jer 49:9 – If grape harvesters came to you,
wouldn't they leave some gleanings?

Obad 5 – If grape pickers came to you,
wouldn't they leave some grapes?

Suggestion:

Jer 49:9 – If grape harvesters came to you,
wouldn't they leave some gleanings?

Obad 5 – If grape harvesters came to you,
wouldn't they leave some gleanings?

Rationale:

Since this statement is identical in Jeremiah and Obadiah, we think the translation should be identical to help make clear the intertextual connection. We notice that the CSB regularly translates עֹלְלוֹת as “gleaning(s)” (Judg 8:2; Isa 17:6, 24:13; Mic 7:1).

**Translation Suggestion for the CSB
From the WELS Translation Liaison Committee
May 2019**

Bible Reference:

Joel 2:28 (H 3:1)
Compared with Acts 2:17

Original text:

Joel 2:28 (H 3:1) – אֶשְׁפֹּךְ אֶת־רוּחִי עַל־כָּל־בְּשָׂר׃

Acts 2:17 – ἐκχεῶ ἀπὸ τοῦ πνεύματός μου ἐπὶ πᾶσαν σάρκα,

CSB rendering:

Joel 2:28 (H 3:1) – I will pour out my Spirit on all humanity;

Acts 2:17 – **I will pour out my Spirit on all people;**

Suggestion:

Joel 2:28 (H 3:1) – I will pour out my Spirit on all people;

Acts 2:17 – **I will pour out my Spirit on all people;**

Rationale:

When an OT passage is quoted in the NT, we think there is benefit in making the wording identical to help show the correspondence, unless there is some reason to do otherwise. In this familiar pair, which could be read together in church on Pentecost, there is no reason for the difference in the CSB (“humanity” vs. “people”). We notice that there are other places in the OT where the CSB translates כָּל־בְּשָׂר׃ with “all people” (e.g. Is 66:16; Ezek 21:4 [E 20:48]; Zech 2:17 [E 13]).

**Translation Suggestion for the CSB
From the WELS Translation Liaison Committee
May 2019**

Bible Reference:

Jonah 2:4 (5)

Original text:

וְאָנֹכִי אֲמַרְתִּי נִגְרַשְׁתִּי מִנְּגִד עֵינַי אֶרְאֶה אִוֹסֶיף לְהִבִּיט אֶל־הַיְכָל קִדְשֶׁךָ:

LXX – και ἐγὼ εἶπα Ἀπῶσμαι ἐξ ὀφθαλμῶν σου, ἄρα προσθήσω τοῦ ἐπιβλέψαι πρὸς τὸν ναὸν τὸν ἅγιόν σου;

CSB rendering:

But I said: I have been banished
from your sight,
yet I will look once more^a
toward your holy temple

^a LXX reads said: *Indeed, will I look . . .?*

Suggestion:

But I said: I have been banished
from your sight,
yet I will look once more^a
toward your holy temple

^a LXX reads sight. *Indeed, will I look . . .?*

Rationale:

The footnote about the LXX overlooks the extra phrase in the LXX between “said” and “Indeed, will I look ...?” Here is the rendering of the *New English Translation of the Septuagint* for Jonah 2:4: “And I said, “I have been driven away from your eyes; shall I add to look at your holy shrine?”

**Translation Suggestion for the CSB
From the WELS Translation Liaison Committee
May 2019**

Bible Reference:

Mark 4:10

Original text:

Καὶ ὅτε ἐγένετο κατὰ μόνας, ἠρώτων αὐτὸν οἱ περὶ αὐτὸν σὺν τοῖς δώδεκα τὰς παραβολάς.

CSB rendering:

When he was alone, those around him with the Twelve, asked him about the parables.

Suggestion:

When he was alone, those around him with the Twelve asked him about the parables.

Rationale:

The comma after “Twelve” should be removed, since it is separating the subject from the verb. We suspect that it may be a carryover from the previous wording of the HCSB, which had a different word order.

**Translation Suggestion for the CSB
From the WELS Translation Liaison Committee
May 2019**

Bible Reference:

Luke 4:38

Original text:

Ἀναστὰς δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς συναγωγῆς εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν Σίμωνος. πενθερὰ δὲ τοῦ Σίμωνος ἦν συνεχομένη πυρετῷ μεγάλῳ καὶ ἠρώτησαν αὐτὸν περὶ αὐτῆς.

CSB rendering:

After he left the synagogue, he entered Simon’s house. Simon’s mother-in-law was suffering from a high fever, and they asked him about her.

Suggestion:

After he left the synagogue, he entered Simon’s house. Simon’s mother-in-law was suffering from a high fever, and they asked him to help her.

Rationale:

The CSB gives the impression that people asked Jesus for information *about* Simon’s mother-in-law. The context implies that they asked Jesus for help *on behalf of* Simon’s mother-in-law. Lexicons indicate that the preposition *περὶ* in Hellenistic Greek can be used in place of *ὑπέρ* with the sense “on behalf of,” and this verse is sometimes referred (TDNT, VI, 54). When the verb *ἐρωτάω* is used in contexts like this with the preposition *περὶ*, BDAG recommends “*beseech someone on someone’s behalf*” (395, #2).

Our suggestion is one way to make the situation clear. There would be other ways, such as: “they appealed to him on her behalf.” This is how the CSB translates a similar phrase in John 16:26 (“I will ask the Father on your behalf”—*ἐγὼ ἐρωτήσω τὸν πατέρα περὶ ὑμῶν*).

**Translation Suggestion for the CSB
From the WELS Translation Liaison Committee
May 2019**

Bible Reference:

Luke 24:46-47

Original text:

⁴⁶καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ὅτι οὕτως γέγραπται παθεῖν τὸν χριστὸν καὶ ἀναστῆναι ἐκ νεκρῶν τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ, ⁴⁷καὶ κηρυχθῆναι ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ μετάνοιαν εἰς ἅφεςιν ἁμαρτιῶν εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη. ἀρξάμενοι ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλὴμ

CSB rendering:

⁴⁶ He also said to them, “This is what is written: The Messiah would suffer and rise from the dead the third day, ⁴⁷ and repentance for forgiveness of sins would be proclaimed in his name to all the nations, beginning at Jerusalem.

Suggestion:

⁴⁶ He also said to them, “This is what is written: The Messiah will suffer and rise from the dead the third day, ⁴⁷ and repentance for forgiveness of sins will be proclaimed in his name to all the nations, beginning at Jerusalem.

Rationale:

The use of “would” in these verses seems misguided, because the phrases in question—following the colon (This is what is written:)—are a direct representation of what is written in the OT. If the phrases were in indirect discourse, then it would be appropriate to have “would”: “It was written that the Messiah would suffer...and repentance...would be proclaimed.”

**Translation Suggestion for the CSB
From the WELS Translation Liaison Committee
May 2019**

Bible Reference:

John 10:35

Original text:

εἰ ἐκείνους εἶπεν θεοὺς πρὸς οὓς ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ ἐγένετο, καὶ οὐ δύναται λυθῆναι ἡ γραφή,

CSB rendering:

If he called those whom the word of God came to ‘gods’—and the Scripture cannot be broken—

Suggestion:

If he called those to whom the word of God came ‘gods’—and the Scripture cannot be broken—

Rationale:

We know that in modern English it is common to put a preposition at the end of a relative clause, rather than putting it before a relative pronoun (“whom the word of God came to” rather than “to whom the word of God came”). But in this passage, the position of “to” is potentially problematic, because it is immediately followed by the noun “gods.” It would be easy for a reader to become confused, thinking that “gods” is the object of the preposition. For the sake of clarity, we suggest a rewording along the lines of other published translations.

**Translation Suggestion for the CSB
From the WELS Translation Liaison Committee
May 2019**

Bible Reference:

2 Corinthians 5:14

Original text:

ἡ γὰρ ἀγάπη τοῦ Χριστοῦ συνέχει ἡμᾶς, κρίναντας τοῦτο, ὅτι εἶς ὑπὲρ πάντων ἀπέθανεν, ἄρα οἱ πάντες ἀπέθανον·

CSB rendering:

For the love of Christ compels us, since we have reached this conclusion: If one died for all, then all died.

Suggestion:

For the love of Christ compels us, since we have reached this conclusion, that one died for all, and therefore all died.

Rationale:

We wonder how the translation “if” can be defended here. We don’t see that ὅτι functions as a hypothetical particle to introduce the protasis of a condition. We suspect that “if” perhaps was inserted simply to indicate the premise of a syllogism with ἄρα following. In any event, the wording does not seem ideal, since there is nothing uncertain or hypothetical about Christ dying for all.

The conjunction ὅτι routinely introduces an explanatory clause after a preceding demonstrative, translated “that” (BDAG, 2; B-D-F §394). To us, this passage seems to fit that usage perfectly. With such an understanding, there are various ways to make the sentence flow well in English, one of which is our suggestion.

**Translation Suggestion for the CSB
From the WELS Translation Liaison Committee
May 2019**

Bible Reference:

Ephesians 4:16

Original text:

ἐξ οὗ πᾶν τὸ σῶμα συναρμολογούμενον καὶ συμβιβασόμενον διὰ πάσης ἀφῆς τῆς ἐπιχορηγίας κατ' ἐνέργειαν ἐν μέτρῳ ἐνὸς ἐκάστου μέρους τὴν αὐξησιν τοῦ σώματος ποιεῖται εἰς οἰκοδομὴν ἑαυτοῦ ἐν ἀγάπῃ.

CSB rendering:

From him the whole body, fitted and knit together by every supporting ligament, promotes the growth of the body for building up itself in love by the proper working of each individual part.

Suggestion:

From him the whole body, fitted and knit together by every supporting ligament, promotes the growth of the body for building itself up in love by the proper working of each individual part.

Rationale:

It seems awkward in English to say: “building up itself.” We think it is more natural to say: “building itself up.”